

## REMARKS

### STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 2 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1-7 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

### REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1, 2, 4 AND 7 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER COBBAERT ET AL. (U.S. 2003/0079046) (hereinafter "Cobbaert")

The rejections of claims 1, 2, 4 and 7 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In the Response to Arguments, pages 7 and 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that the feature, "common communication path so that all objects on the communication path can access the transmission," upon which the applicant relies is not recited in rejected independent claims 1, 2, and 7.

However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of the independent claim 1, for example. Independent claim 1 recites, "generating a transmission, sent via a communication path common to the first, second, and third computer." Therefore, it is inherent, and would be easily understood by one of ordinary skill in the art, that all objects, for example computers, on the communication path can access the transmission. Thus, the above-mentioned feature relied upon is currently recited in independent claim 1, for example.

The Examiner further argues in the Response to Arguments, page 8 of the Office Action, that a common communication path in the instant application is defined as a LAN or any similar communications means in the specification, and Cobbaert, as modified, teaches a first and a second computer receiving transmitted information via a communication path.

However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Cobbaert. Cobbaert relates to a method and system for performing data communication between program objects in an objected oriented programming system, for example an object-oriented operating system (OS). (Cobbaert, page 1, para. 0001). Specifically, in Fig. 3 of Cobbaert, a communications mechanism is shown illustrating when a program object A intends to send a message to program object B, the message is first sent to the OS. The OS takes the message from program object A and delivers the message to program object B. Once program object B responds to the message from program object A, program object B will send the message to the program object A via the OS. The OS will deliver the message received from

program object B to program object A. Stated another way, program objects in a single system communicate to one another through the OS. Therefore, Cobbaert does not teach or suggest the use of a first and a second computer that receive the transmitted information via a common communication path.

Furthermore, the Examiner states that independent claims 2 and 7 recite, "transmitting messages" and "messages so transmitted to the plurality of objects", so that one of ordinary skill in the art would interpret that multiple messages are sent to multiple objects, for example, each message for each object via LAN communication means.

Thus, independent claims 2 and 7 are amended herein to further clarify that each message is receivable by a plurality of objects. Thus, independent claims 2 and 7 further distinguish over the cited art. That is, according to the present invention, the transmission is simply sent to a common communication path, so that all objects (for example, computers) on the communication path can access the transmission. Thus, the present invention does not require specifically directing a message to each individual object, as required by Cobbaert.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 2 and 7 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

Claim 4 depends from claim 2 and inherits the patentability thereof. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claim 4 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 3, 5 AND 6 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER COBBAERT AS APPLIED TO CLAIM 2 IN VIEW OF HAO ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 5,844,553)

Claims 3, 5 and 6 depend from claim 2 and inherit the patentability thereof. Thus, the rejections of claims 3, 5 and 6 are respectfully traversed for at least the reasons provided above for independent claim 2.

It is further submitted that Hao et al. does not teach or even suggest the recitations of independent claim 2, described above.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/652,485

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 5, 2006

By: Michael P. Stanley  
Michael P. Stanley  
Registration No. 58,523

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501